

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_123393
Title of the Manuscript:	Gut microbiome in Autism spectrum disorder ASD individuals and potential treatment strategies
Type of the Article	Review

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>I find this manuscript valuable because it tackles an important topic that's gaining traction in the scientific community. With the increasing prevalence of Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), understanding the role of the gut microbiome in its development and management is critical. This paper does a good job of exploring this complex relationship and offers insights into potential treatment strategies like microbiota transfer therapy and probiotics. These aspects make the manuscript particularly relevant and beneficial for guiding future research and clinical approaches to ASD.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Gut Microbiome in Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) Individuals and Potential Treatment Strategies" is generally suitable, as it clearly conveys the main focus of the manuscript. However, to enhance clarity and specificity, a suggested alternative could be: "The Role of Gut Microbiome in Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) and Emerging Treatment Strategies." This title more explicitly reflects the exploration of both the microbiome's role and the therapeutic approaches.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a decent overview of the manuscript but lacks precision in certain areas. It could benefit from more specific details about the methodology and the key findings. For instance, including the specific gut microbiota associated with ASD and the types of treatment strategies reviewed (e.g., microbiota transfer therapy, probiotics) would enhance the abstract's informativeness. Additionally, refining the language to avoid vague statements, such as "more research is needed," and instead offering specific recommendations would improve the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's subsections and overall structure are generally appropriate for a review article. However, a significant limitation is that, although the purpose is stated in the abstract, the aim, objectives, or research questions are not explicitly stated in the introduction section. Clearly defining these elements in the introduction is crucial as it guides the reader through the review's intent and scope. Additionally, the "Results and Discussion" section could benefit from clearer organization, with distinct subsections for the different treatment strategies and their outcomes to enhance readability and coherence.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its thorough review of current literature, adherence to the PRISMA guidelines, and inclusion of multiple studies to support its claims. The systematic approach to reviewing the literature ensures that the conclusions drawn are well-founded and evidence-based. Additionally, the manuscript's discussion on the potential therapeutic interventions, such as microbiota transfer therapy and probiotics, is well-grounded in recent scientific research, further validating its scientific rigor.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are both sufficient and recent, covering a broad range of studies published within the last decade. This ensures that the review is up-to-date with the latest research developments in the field of ASD and gut microbiome. However, to further strengthen the manuscript, it may be beneficial to include more recent studies from 2023 that discuss the latest advancements in gut-brain axis research or novel microbiome-based therapies.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article need improvement to meet the standards of scholarly communication. There are several grammatical errors, awkward phrasings, and inconsistencies in tense usage throughout the manuscript. A thorough proofreading and editing process is recommended to enhance clarity, readability, and professionalism.</p> <p>For Example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grammar Correction: "ASD patients has" is corrected to "Patients with ASD have" to ensure subject-verb agreement. • Punctuation: Commas are added after "cortex" and "brain weight" to improve readability. • Clarity: "Abnormal cortical pattern" is changed to "abnormal cortical patterns" for consistency and accuracy. • Terminology: "Autism disorder" is more accurately referred to as "autism spectrum disorder (ASD)." • Punctuation: A comma is added after "composition" to separate the clauses. • Word Choice: "Many gastrointestinal GI problems" is rephrased to "a range of gastrointestinal (GI) issues" for smoother flow and professional tone. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript addresses a critical and timely topic in autism research. The integration of gut microbiome studies with potential treatment strategies is a valuable contribution to the field. However, refining the language and structure would significantly enhance the manuscript's impact and readability.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Akehsan Dahlan</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia</p>